



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/652,695	08/31/2000	Jim B. Estipona	INTL-0448-US (P9559)	3818

7590 09/03/2003
Timothy N Trop
Trop Pruner & Hu PC
Ste 100
8554 Katy Freeway
Houston, TX 77024

EXAMINER

CORNWELL, BRIAN I

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2614

DATE MAILED: 09/03/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

CM

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/652,695

Applicant(s)

ESTIPONA, JIM B.

Examiner

Brian Cornwell

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 August 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: Fig. 1 (20a),(20b); Fig. 2 (102). A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-6,8-12,14-16,17,21-22,24-25 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Advanced Television Enhancement Forum Specification (ATVEF) Version 1.1r26, cited by applicant.

As to claim 1, ATVEF discloses transmitting and receiving enhanced television content and Session Description Protocol (SDP) records (pg. 10 par. 5-6 and pg. 12 par. 6). The reference particularly discloses the use of session announcements that include unique session identifiers (which by definition must be numeric strings) having values that announce the availability of

Art Unit: 2614

particular broadcasts, which “can be a permanent announcement for all programming on a broadcast channel or for a particular show” (pg. 13). The reference does not disclose the availability of an Electronic Program Guide (EPG) as programming on a broadcast channel. However the examiner gives official notice that it is notoriously well known in the art of television broadcasting to broadcast an EPG for the purpose of efficiently navigating through available programming and data services. Therefore it is submitted that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the ATVEF announcement to announce the availability of an EPG for the purpose of making the viewer aware of the EPG’s availability.

As to claim 2, ATVEF discloses the use of announcements to announce currently available programming to the receiver. The reference particularly discloses the “owner & session identifier, defined in SDP spec. (RFC 2327)” (pg. 13).

Claim 3 is met by that discussed above for claim 1.

Claim 4 is met by that discussed above for claim 1.

As to claim 5, the reference discloses the use of any numeric string for the session identifier. While the reference does not disclose the use of the specific number chosen by the applicant, this is not considered to be a patentable distinction. Therefore it is submitted that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a number indicative of a much earlier time frame in NTP-format for the purpose of using a value that is unlikely to be used (while in NTP-format), as a matter of design choice.

As to claim 6, ATVEF discloses the use of a session name in the SDP announcement (pg. 13) as claimed.

Art Unit: 2614

Claim 8 is met by that discussed above for claim 1.

Claim 9 is met by that discussed above for claim 2.

Claim 10 is met by that discussed above for claim 1.

Claim 11 is met by that discussed above for claim 1.

Claim 12 is met by that discussed above for claim 5.

Claim 14 is met by that discussed above for claim 1.

Claim 15 is met by that discussed above for claim 1.

Claim 16 is met by that discussed above for claim 5.

Claim 17 is met by that discussed above for claim 1.

Claim 21 is met by that discussed above for claim 1.

Claim 22 is met by that discussed above for claim 1.

Claim 24 is met by that discussed above for claim 1.

As to claim 25, the ATVEF discloses extracting and comparing version numbers, which can be in NTP format, from within the SDP records (pg.13), as claimed.

3. Claims 7,13,18-20,23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the ATVEF in view of Gagnon et al (6,522,342), cited by examiner.

As to claim 7, ATVEF discloses everything, as described above, except the claimed "human readable session name indicative of an electronic programming guide". Gagnon et al discloses several examples of session announcement records in announcing the availability of enhanced television content. The reference particularly discloses the use of a human readable session name that is descriptive/indicative of the television enhancement (s=Data Catalog; fig.32B). The reference further particularly discloses the use of a session name that is

Art Unit: 2614

descriptive/indicative of the broadcast channel carrying the enhancement (s=CNBC; fig.32D).

While the reference does not disclose the use of the specific name chosen by the applicant, this is not considered to be a patentable distinction. Therefore it is submitted that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a name descriptive/indicative of a broadcast channel containing an EPG for the purpose of further informing the viewer of the enhancement.

Claim 13 is met by that discussed above for claim 7.

As to claim 18, the ATVEF discloses everything, as described above, except the indication of "whether the enhanced television content includes an" EPG. Gagnon et al discloses an indication of the availability of an EPG in the main user interface (fig.2A (152)).

As to claim 19, Gagnon et al also discloses the use of a version number within the "o" field. The version number indicates the number of previous versions of the enhancement content records (col.35 ln.41-45), as claimed.

As to claim 20, it is inherent within the SDP to process the announcement without regard to the enhancement, if the version number is not higher than the previously received version numbers.

Claim 23 is met by that discussed above for claim 20.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Cornwell whose telephone number is 703-305-6955. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6-4 (alternate Fridays off).

Art Unit: 2614

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on 703-305-4795. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4750.

BIC
August 25, 2003


JOHN MILLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600